

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

	T SWING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/739,034	FILING DATE 12/14/2000	Werner Obrecht	Mo-5842/LeA 34,092	4130
BAYER COF	7590 12/04/2002 PROPATION		EXAMI	NER
PATENT DEP	ARTMENT		SERGENT, RABON A	
PITTSBURGH	I, PA 15205		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711 DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.

09/739,034

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Office Action Summary

Rabon Sergent

Art Unit 1711

Obrecht et al.

7	he MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Period for R A SHORT THE MAIL	eply ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  It is no page to a equilable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In	TO EXPIREthree MONTH(S) FROM  no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the
mailing date  If the period  If NO period  Failure to rep		the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered thirty; and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
		2002
	and the second	ction is non-final.
2a) 🗌 Th	s action is FINAL. 2b) XI This ac	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
clo	sed in accordance with the practice under $E_{X}$ $ ho$	parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition	of Claims	is/are pending in the application.
4) 💢 Cla	sim(s) <u>1, 2, 4-10, and 13-15</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4a)	Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
EV CI	nim(s)	10/4/0
a [7] 0	-im/a) 1 2 4-10 and 13-15	13/8/0 / 0/0000
_		
/)□ Cl	oims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
8) L Cl		
* *		
10\[ T	is/a	are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examination
11\□ T	he proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examine
11)□ 1	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	bly to this Office action.
40\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.
Priority U	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a).[∇]	All b)□ Some* c)□ None of:	
1	The second of the priority documents	have been received.
	The second of the priority documents	have been received in Application No.
3	Copies of the certified copies of the priorit application from the International E e the attached detailed Office action for a list o	ty documents have been received in this National Stage  Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*Se	e the attached detailed Office bottom for dome Acknowledgement is made of a claim for dome	estic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
_	the foreign language provis	sional application has been received.
a) ⊔ 45\□	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for dome	estic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.
Attachme	int(s) ice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
	ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) [] Info	ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	6) Other:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The language, "said styrene/butadiene copolymers", lacks antecedence from claim 1.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Evidence that claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 13-15 fail to correspond in scope with that which applicants regard as the invention can be found in Paper No. 5, filed September 18, 2002. In that paper, applicants have stated in response to the prior art rejections in view of JP 57-212239 and JP 5-17630 that component A) does not correspond to a liquid diene rubber, and this statement indicates that the invention is different from what is defined in the claims because component A), as claimed, is clearly met by liquid diene rubber components. Applicants have provided no explanation as to how component A), as claimed, differs from the disclosed liquid diene rubbers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (703) 308-2982.

R. Sergent November 30, 2002